

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and accompanying amendments. Claims 1-66 were pending, of which 1-20 and 22-66 were withdrawn from consideration. Applicant amends claims 21, 24-27, 31, 32, and 34, cancels claims 1-20, 22-23, 28-30, 33, and 35-66 without prejudice or disclaimer, and adds new claims 67-82 herein. As a result, claims 21, 24-27, 31, 32, 34, and 67-82 are pending in the instant application, of which claims 24-27, 31, 32, and 34 are withdrawn from consideration.

The specification stands objected to for containing minor errors. In response, Applicant amends the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Specifically, Applicant amends paragraph [0123] of the published application to insert reference numeral "101" after "base film" in reference to FIG. 1A, paragraph [0140] to replace "visocosity" with correctly spelled "viscosity", and paragraph [0149] to replace "insulting" with correctly spelled "insulating". These amendments are formal in nature and add no new matter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of these objections to the specification.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koh et al. (U.S. 5,427,976) in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. 2003/0083203). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that Koh and Hashimoto, both alone and in combination, fail to render obvious the features recited in claim 21 as amended herein. Support for the amendments to claim 21 may be found throughout the Applicant's specification as filed, for example in paragraphs [0153] to [0173] of Applicant's published application and FIGs. 1D and 2A.

For example, Koh fails to teach the feature recited in amended claim 21, "forming a second semiconductor film containing an impurity element over the first semiconductor film". While Examiner's first interpretation asserts that Koh teaches first and second semiconductor films (45 and 47), Koh fails to teach a second insulating film covering the first insulating film and the first conductive film. Likewise, Koh fails to teach the features,

forming a second conductive film by spurting droplets containing a second conductive material so that the second conductive film covers a side surface of each of the second insulating film, the first semiconductor film and the second semiconductor film;
etching the second semiconductor film by using the second conductive film as a mask

recited in amended claim 21. Neither the Examiner's first nor second interpretations of Koh assert that Koh teaches these features and a detailed reading of Koh reveals the remainder of the reference also fails to teach these features. Additionally, Hashimoto fails to cure these deficiencies of Koh. For at least these reasons, Koh and Hashimoto, taken alone and in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious Applicant's amended claim 21.

Claim 21 additionally stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (U.S. 6,180,976) in view of Drummond et al. (U.S. 5,132,248). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that Roy and Drummond, both alone and in combination, fail to render obvious the features recited in claim 21 as amended herein.

Roy simply fails to teach the features,

forming a second conductive film by spurring droplets containing
a second conductive material so that the second conductive film
covers a side surface of each of the second insulating film, the first
semiconductor film and the second semiconductor film;
etching the second semiconductor film by using the second
conductive film as a mask

recited in amended claim 21. Also, Drummond fails to cure these deficiencies of Roy. For at least these reasons, Roy and Drummond, taken alone and in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious Applicant's amended claim 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that because all prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, fails to fairly suggest or render obvious the features recited in claim 21, that only with the benefit of hindsight knowledge gleaned from Applicant's own disclosure would a person of ordinary skill in the art be able to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Withdrawn claims 24-27, 31-32 and 34 are amended herein to depend from claim 21. These amendments are formal in nature and add no new matter.

Applicant additionally adds new claims 67-82 herein. New claim 67 recites features analogous to amended claim 21 and the additional feature, "baking the first conductive film in an oxygen containing atmosphere". Support for this feature may be found throughout the specification, for example in paragraph [0141] of Applicant's published application. New claim 68 recites features analogous to amended claim 21 and the additional feature, "wherein

the second insulating film, the first semiconductor film and the second semiconductor film are formed consecutively without being exposed to the atmosphere”. Support for this feature may be found throughout the specification, for example in paragraph [0160] of Applicant’s published application. New claims 69-75 and 76-82 are analogous to claims 24-27, 31-32, and 34 as originally filed, thus no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claims 67-82.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, Applicant invites Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney/agent to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey L. Costellia, Reg. No. 35,483/
Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483
Attorney for Applicant

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000